

the great good which is proposed to be accomplished, and which cannot be accomplished unless we do. If we give them up, the drunkard can be reformed. If we do not, he cannot.

Then we come to this question. Shall we make this surrender? I will not ask for it on any other ground. Here is a broad and ample ground to claim the surrender. It is needful, it is unwise, it is unphilosophical, to ask it on any other ground. We ask it for the deliverance of half a million of our countrymen, who may be literally said to be "drawn unto death."

But it is asked on the other side, Are we ever bound to forego the enjoyment of anything that is healthful, and innocent, and not forbidden by the word of God? Yes, sir, in innumerable cases. Where our self-sacrifice is overbalanced by the good to be secured to others, we ought cheerfully to make the surrender. Now, I ask, what is all the addition made to our health and cheerfulness and pleasure by the use of fermented drinks, as estimated by the most sanguine advocate among the sober, when set in competition with the reform of half a million of drunkards? Sir, had we the sympathy of Paul for the wretched, we should not be long in doing it. It was on this principle that he could see it to be right for him neither to eat meat nor drink wine nor any thing whereby a brother is injured. It was from this sentiment, reigning in his heart, that he said, "Who is weak and I am not weak?" And again, "To the weak became I as weak." Now I ask, who is there among our neighbors that is weak, who needs the aid and sympathy of his brethren, as the poor drunkard? His self-control is trodden in the dust, and his body and soul at the mercy of his appetite, and that appetite irresistibly solicited at the tables of professors of religion and by the practices of the sober.

Here the president observed that the speaker had occupied the fifteen minutes allowed by rule; but the universal voice cried, Go on, go on; and Mr. S. proceeded.

Sir, the Bible provides us with rules and principles for every case that can occur in life. Did we, as the Bible requires, look not every man on his own things, but every man on the things of others; were we willing to be as wicked Cain would not be, our brother's keeper, how soon should we see drunkards reformed.

I have heard it said that it is man's right to drink wine. Sir, I love human rights, dearly. I am always prepared to stand up and plead for them, with all my soul. I will never consent to a hair's breadth of encroachment on them. But sometimes it is beautiful and proper for men to recede from their rights, for the good of others. But it is our duty always to preserve and maintain God's rights over men. To illustrate my meaning, I would say to the slave, "You had better recede from your rights, than to vindicate them by force." But I would say to the slave's master, "It is God's right to claim that liberty be restored to his prisoner, and that right you are not to withhold a moment." So I would say to the sober, "It is God's right that you should recede from your own pleasures, and give up the drinking, which stands in the way of the reform of drunkards."

Great stress is laid on the fact that Christ made wine—and it is argued from this fact, that we may drink wine, at least at weddings. Hundreds, if not thousands of ministers of the gospel drink wine on those occasions, who never drink it at other times. My reasons just stated, to show that our Savior's drinking of wine does not authorize our drinking of wine in our circumstances, may be employed to show also, that his conversation of water into wine does not justify our drinking of wine. But there are other reasons why our opponents should not plead this miracle in excuse of wine drinking. He must have very unworthy views of the design of our Savior's miracles, who supposes, that he performed them for the gratification of the palate. No; the object of our Savior's miracles was to authenticate his messages and to prove his divinity. It is true, that he very often made the occasions for doing good to the bodies of men the occasions for performing his miracles. It accorded with his benevolence to do so. It also accorded with what had been foretold of him to do so. It was also the policy of our Savior to perform his miracles on those occasions—on those objects—where men wanted him to perform them. He may have improved those occasions, not so much to gratify and to comfort those around him, as to make the miracles more impressive upon them.

They who maintain that in those cases where our Savior raised to health and to life, kindness to the subjects of them was the variable design of his miracles, think that analogy warrants them in believing that his design in converting the water into wine was to gratify the appetite of the wedding party. But when we reflect, that in raising Lazarus to life, he recalled one from the joys of heaven to suffer again the pains and trials of earth, it can no longer be said that kindness to the subjects of his miracles, was the variable design of them. In the miracle under consideration, the wedding party wanted—asked for, what he gave them. He was told, "they have no wine." And now, on the supposition that rich cake was then used on those occasions, as it is now, and he had been told, "they have no cake"—is it not altogether probable, that he would have made that the occasion of performing his miracle, and have furnished the company with cake?

And who in that case would have argued, because the Savior furnished it, that such cake is healthful? Who would thus have been willing to contradict all experience of its unhealthfulness? But the sacred historian informs us, beyond all controversy, of the object and effect of the miracle in question,—and that is, "that the disciples believed on him."

"This beginning of miracles," says he, "did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him." Mark the language:—"This beginning of miracles"—not this beginning of gratifications of the palate—"manifested forth his glory"—not manifested forth his love of pleasing the appetite for wine. And then we come to the legitimate effect—the object of all our Savior's miracles—"and his disciples believed on him." Not, they thanked and loved him for the trifling pleasure of a drink of wine. No, the historian is guilty of no such belittling of the Savior and his miracle and his disciples. "They believed on him." They did that, than which nothing is more blessed to him who does it, and nothing more honorable to Jesus—"They believed on him."

It is a good rule, never to adopt such an interpretation of the Scriptures, as would detract from the dignity of God. But to say that he performed a miracle for the mere purpose of gratifying the palate, is to present him in a most ludicrous light.

[Here the rule was again interposed, and

again the unanimous voice of the Convention bid the speaker go on.]

I pass now, Sir, to the question, Whether it is right to circulate the old pledge? It is said by many, that to circulate the new pledge will bring the old pledge into disrepute. I admit it. It does go to make the old pledge disreputable and nugatory. Yet, I am in favor of the new pledge. And still I love the old pledge. I believe I have not been originally deficient in labors for the old pledge. And when Dr. Edwards, or some other historian, shall write the epitaph of the old pledge, I have no fears that he will swell its praises beyond what is due. But, Sir, it is the old dispensation of the Temperance Reform, and is now manifestly ready to vanish away. But the new pledge is the bringing in of a better hope, and it makes the comers thereto perfect.

When the temperance reform begun, the recovery of drunkards was thought impossible. It was thought that to attempt to reclaim the drunkard, was but a vain effort, & that it was almost no crime not to care for him, and he was abandoned to a fate as terrible as it was thought to be inevitable. Now, Sir, we have learned that he can be reformed. But not by the old pledge. The old pledge overlooks the drunkard. It positively injures the drunkard, by implicitly admitting the use of liquors which are fatal to him. May we then, for the mere sake of our own consistency, continue to use this old pledge? Consistency! I hate that word in its present application. We ought constantly to change and grow better. Shall we shut our eyes to this light and these developments? If we are asked at the judgment seat, why we did not reclaim these half million drunkards, it will be no answer that when we first adopted the rules of the Temperance Reform, we did not know that it was practicable, and therefore we adopted a pledge, which did not reach his case, and consistency forbade a change. Sir, we dare not say this; we cannot meet the interrogatory, "Why, when you knew this, did you not modify your system, and adapt your pledge to the calls of distressed humanity—the calls of God?"

It is sometimes objected that if we adopt the *tee-total* pledge, we shall drive off many subscribers to the old pledge, and they will return to the use of strong drink. Sir, I do not believe this. I have two reasons; one is that I have never known such a case, and the other, that I think too well of the subscribers of the old pledge to believe this of them. I cannot believe that out of disgust to the new pledge, they will turn round and punish themselves. I have known spoiled children who, when their unreasonable desires were refused, would seek to punish their mothers by wounding their own persons. But I have yet to meet with a single subscriber of the old pledge, who will say, "Unless you will allow me the use of fermented drinks, I will go back to the use of ardent spirits."

It is said our youth will not take ground against ardent spirits, if we are such ultras as to go against all fermented drinks. So it used to be said in the beginning, in regard to total abstinence from ardent spirits—"If you will only go against intemperance, you will have the whole community with you." In the millennium, sir, it may subserve the cause of truth to shape your course in a manner agreeable to the whole community. But not till then.

I have one answer to all these objections: I hold this truth, that when God in his providence has made it plain to us that the drunkard cannot be reformed but by an abandonment of all intoxicating drinks, we are bound to adopt that course, let what will be the evil consequences men may imagine from it. God's providences are all consistent and harmonious, though our short sight may not be able to detect the agreement. And when God has made it plain that we must adopt a certain course in order to reclaim drunkards, we cannot refuse without impeaching his wisdom and goodness.

There are some who advocate abstinence from fermented drinks, and yet think it expedient to have a corresponding pledge. This is a most important point, and ought to be well considered. Let not the sober man carry to the drunkard the *tee-total* pledge, unless he is willing to subscribe it himself. Weakened as the drunkard's self-respect is, he cannot brook so invidious a distinction as this, to subscribe a pledge which he is told is adapted exclusively to drunkards, & which would very soon acquire the name of the *drunkard's pledge*.

Again, the drunkard needs the whole power of the pledge to sustain him against the powerful tendencies to a relapse with which he is beset. And here permit me to illustrate my ideas of the power of the pledge, by reading a few lines from a letter addressed sometime since to Mr. Delavan, describing the reformation of the drunkards of a neighborhood. All are not adequately sensible of the importance of the pledge to a reformed drunkard.

[Here Mr. S. read the following extract from his own letter to Mr. Delavan, dated September 11th, 1833, giving the interesting history of the reformation in Peterboro']

The pledge associates him with the respectable, who have subscribed it; and he feels himself honored by the association, & stimulated to well-doing. This public promise constitutes, in his view, whatever it may be in fact, a far more solemn appeal to the living God than do his private and, generally, vague and hesitating resolutions of amendment; and he is conscious that this public promise fixes upon him the eyes of hundreds of his fellow-beings, who will be ready to applaud him for his fidelity to it, or to despise and abhor its violation. The temperance pledge in the hour of temptation, is like the amulet worn of old to preserve its wearer from evils. It may be likened also to some adopted maxim, which, embodying the just conclusion of a long and wise train of thought, often comes greatly to one's help in an emergency, and when he is in no circumstances for a process of reasoning. The remembered pledge often exerts a saving power, when the waves of temptation beat violently against the trembling resolution of the reformed drunkard. He may not be able to answer the ingenious and plausible arguments, with which his tempters assail him; but he falls back with confidence and safety upon his pledge, as upon a conclusion to which he arrived, in a season more propitious than the present, for determining his duty. And now, although the peril of the crisis be so great as to strip him of every other resource and every other means of escape, here, in the temperance pledge, is that "last plank" which saves him.

There is another consideration, showing the value of the pledge to the reformed drunkard. If it had no other name to it than his own, it might and probably would avail him little. But his respectable neighbors, & hundreds of thousands of the wise and good

all over the land, have honored it with their names; and he feels that he stands in their strength. Hence it is, that he is able to stand; whilst without this dependence, he would be tottering and falling through his inherent feebleness. You have heard the story of our countryman at the battle of Yorktown, who, to use his expression, "fought on his own hook." There are some such self-poised and independent spirits. But the reformed drunkard, in respect to his conflict with the temptations of rum, is far from being one of them. In that conflict, and in his reliance on his associates in the pledge, he is more like the coward soldier, who, but for his identification of himself with his country's cause, and with the thousands of strong hands and stout hearts, that are supporting it by his side, would have "no stomach for the fight."

Sir, men are not generally better than their professed principles. Now, I ask, why so many members of the temperance society got drunk (I state the fact on my responsibility,) last new-years day? The temperance pledge deceived them. To show how it works, see how soon the temperance society made the drinking of ardent spirits unfashionable. And will not that power—the power of fashion—be tremendous, when arrayed as it is on the side of drinking fermented liquors? If we retain the old pledge, I believe the temperance society will prove a curse instead of a blessing; for the men will drink fermented liquors, feeling that they are backed up by the authority of the temperance society.

Suppose all the physicians in the state should prescribe gin. No doubt it would fall into universal disuse. But what would be the issue? The implied sanction of all medical men would be given to the drinking of rum, and brandy, and whiskey, and there would be an instant and unprecedented zest to these liquors.

Sir, the sober must come out and pledge themselves publicly on the very same ground where we wish drunkards to stand. Otherwise the drunkard cannot have confidence in us, and we can do him no good. No wonder the drunkard is slow to give us his confidence. Confidence is a plant of slow growth and difficult germination in the breast of a drunkard. He has been so abused, and deluded, and injured, and trodden down, that it is no wonder he is now reluctant to give forth his confidence. But let him see the sober and the benevolent come fully up to the *tee-total* pledge, and we shall subdue him at once. If the doors of his confidence ever turn on their unaccustomed hinges, it will be when the appeal comes up to him from self-denial, endured for his sake.

But religion is appealed to, and we are referred to the example of the Savior to justify the use of wine—that Savior, whose religion is emphatically the religion of self-denial, and who has established it as a principle in the economy of his kingdom, that those who refuse to become pupils in that school shall not be made the honored instruments of accomplishing any great good. One great work which God has set before his children in this country is, the restoration & salvation of half a million of drunkards. If they will not consent to make any sacrifices for this object—if they will go round the cross, I will not say they will be rejected of God, but I will say that he will not allow them to labor effectively in this enterprise.

In the village where I reside, we felt years ago, that this self-denial was required. We met it, I hope as Christians, and no friend of temperance there continued to pollute his lips with any intoxicating drinks. And God blessed us in making us the happy instruments of reforming almost all our drunkards. Now, DID WE DO RIGHT? I hear you answer, "Yes, in your circumstances, attempting to reform drunkards, you could not do otherwise." Then I ask the people of this city, and of other cities, whether, instead of attempting to throw back upon the country a diluted and adulterated principle, to destroy our reformed drunkards, whether they ought not to place themselves in the same circumstances, by attempting to reform their drunkards?

Now, shall the New-York State Temperance Society give any countenance to the old pledge? I hold not. It overlooks and sacrifices half a million drunkards, and in the present condition of society it is hostile to the interests of temperance. Instead of presenting it, I hold it to be not only inexpedient but morally wrong to present it. There was a time when I could have conscientiously advised a neighbor to ascend the Mississippi river by the help of a setting-peg. But who now could in good faith recommend the snail-paced scow in place of the rapid steamboat? It is fully equally superlative to hold up together the old pledge and the new pledge, as if there was any parallel between the two in point of utility.

The interesting and powerful debate was continued through the day, by Messrs. Nott, Tucker, Beman, Welch and Potter, Messrs. B. Green, Culver and Smith, Messrs. Wilkinson, Turner, A. Taber, B. R. Wood and others.

Mr. Smith's resolution was then put, and carried without a dissenting voice.

CONGRESSIONAL.

MONDAY, MARCH 7.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. Robertson asked the consent of the House to submit the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee for the District of Columbia be instructed to inquire into the expediency of ceding the said District back to the States of Virginia and Maryland respectively, and to report specially.

1st. The prominent objections (if any) to the validity of such cession.

2d. The advantages or disadvantages likely to result from this measure (if adopted) to the said States, to the District itself, and its inhabitants, or to the United States.

3d. The reservations and provisions that should accompany such cession, with a view to the permanent continuance of the Seat of Government in the said District, the entire protection and preservation of the property of the United States therein, and the attainment of such other objects as the committee may deem necessary and proper, to guard the rights and interests of all; and that the said committee have power to send for persons and papers.

Objections being made, Mr. Robertson moved the suspension of the Rules, in order to enable him to offer the resolution.

Mr. Garland, of Louisiana, called for the yeas and nays on this motion, and they were ordered.

Mr. Bouldin, remarking that this was an important subject, and that the House was thin, moved a call of the House; which was ordered.

After some time, on motion of Mr. Van derpoel, the call was suspended.

The question being taken, it was decided in the negative—yeas 71, nays 114.

So the House refused to suspend the Rules for the purpose indicated.

Mr. Slade presented memorials praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, from 487 females and 19 male citizens of this State of Vermont, from 548 females and 274 male citizens of Dover, in the State of New Hampshire, and from 66 females and 54 male citizens of Derry, in the same State; which were referred to the committee appointed under the resolution offered by Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina.

Mr. Jenifer presented a memorial from Richard Mackall, praying compensation for the destruction of a house, and other property, by the British, during the late war.

Also, a similar one from Alexander Somerville, for himself and others;

Also, from John G. Mackall.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT.

By and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

William D. Jones, of Cincinnati, Ohio, to be Consul for the city of Mexico.

Edmund C. Wataugh, to be Consul for Trinidad de Cuba.

Edward Beyerback, to be Consul for Talcahuano, in Chili.

Charles Lane, to be Marshal for the District of New Hampshire.

THE TELEGRAPH.

MARCH 17.

From the N. Y. Spectator.

VERMONT ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The second annual meeting of the Vermont Anti-Slavery Society, was held at Middlebury, on the 16th of February. From the list of officers and committees named in its organization, we should infer that it was numerously attended. They passed a series of exciting resolutions, and prepared the way for another tempest in the House of Representatives, by adopting a memorial on the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia. One of the resolutions is in the words following, viz:—

Resolved, That we consider the many recent attempts to stifle free discussion by mobs and riotous assemblies, as the most alarming evidence of the decline of public morals, public patriotism and public liberty, and as totally subversive, if acquiesced in by the community, of the principles of our government and the existence of freedom.

Most heartily do we assent to the soundness of the doctrine of this resolution. And we beg leave to inquire of the editor of the Vermont Telegraph, whether it was adopted by a unanimous vote? (1.) The reason of putting the question is this:—We observe the name of Jonathan P. Miller, of Montpelier, as a Vice President of the meeting. (2.)—Now it was stated in the papers last autumn, that during an excitement upon the anti-slavery subject at Montpelier, in order to help forward the anti-slavery cause, Col. Miller said he would give twenty-five dollars toward getting up a riot. If he voted for this resolution now, he has probably changed his views. (3.)

Another of the resolutions is the following:—

Resolved, That we admire the intrepidity, fortitude and christian philosophy of James G. Birney, in the stand he has taken against slavery and in favor of immediate emancipation, and that we commend the Philanthropist, published by him, to the patronage of the friends of human right.

Now we beg leave to inquire whether Mr. Birney did not sell his own slaves, AND POCKET THE MONEY, before he joined the anti-slavery society? (4.)

Among the letters read at this meeting, was one from the Rev. Dr. Cox—now Professor Cox, of the Auburn Theological Seminary. Surely this gentleman does not understand "the things that belong to his peace," or he would leave this matter alone. (5.) It is not long since, that in regard to a very ill-judged preface which he wrote and sent to England, for Judge Jay's book, when called upon by his friends to explain his conduct to his associates of the Auburn faculty, his excuse was that he had forgotten what he did write! But the Vermonters have published his letter, and he cannot now very readily forget to remember its contents. (6.) In this letter now before us, he declares:—

"I hesitate not a moment to say, that, other things being equal, a slave of any description ought to be excluded from the communion of the church; and that, by consequence, the members of the church, individually, ought to withhold communion from slave holders and slave dealers universally."

Now, Doctor Cox is a professor in a theological institution, and it becomes important to inquire whether he teaches such doctrines *Ex Cathedra*? (7.) Certainly, Christ and his apostles did not so teach, or so preach. (8.)

NOTES.

(1.) Yes—*namine contradicente*.

(2.) Not a "Vice President of the meeting" but of the Society. He was not present at the last meeting, but has been a Vice President of the Society, from its organization.

(3.) So "it was stated in the papers"—as the editor of the N. Y. Spectator will probably recollect with mortification—that Beriah Green solemnized a marriage between a couple, one of which was black, and the other white. "It was stated in the papers" that George Thompson declared, that the slaves ought to cut their masters' throats. And "it was stated in the papers" recently, that there

had been a bloody insurrection of the slaves at Nashville, Tennessee. It is a humiliating fact that a thousand things are stated in the papers, in these days, that have no foundation in truth. [This fact should not drive people to abandon paper-reading, nor destroy their confidence in all statements, or in all papers; but it should lead them to greater scrutiny and carefulness in their search after truth.] This talk of the editor of the Spectator about what was stated in the papers is, to say the least, a vague and irresponsible use of language. A matter couched in so loose and indirect terms, we feel under no obligation to hunt up. This much, however, we can state directly, without referring to the papers: Samuel J. May stated to us, on his return from Montpelier, where he was mobbed, that when a missile came flying through the window, during his address, this Jona. P. Miller, throwing himself between the speaker and his demoniacal assailants, raised the window and sat in the gap—thus shielding the speaker from further annoyance.

(4.) In view of the facts that have been before the world for ten months past, this is a most astonishing question. The facts are briefly these: Some two years ago, Mr. Birney had his attention turned to the sinfulness of slavery. During the time that his mind was exercised on this subject, he was in Cincinnati, where he found Phelps' Lectures on Slavery. He carried home the work to Kentucky, examined it, and became fully convinced that slavery is sinful. From that moment he was an immediate abolitionist, and forthwith he put his principles into practice, giving unconditional emancipation to all his slaves. He then offered to hire them. For this they neither cut his throat nor burned his house, nor did they feel themselves "turned loose," to rove about as idlers and vagabonds. This deed of justice, which they took as the greatest kindness, was a chain stronger than iron, binding them to his interests. Their hearts burst with gratitude. He hired them at such wages that they laid up one half of their earnings the first year.

This is an unclothed skeleton of what Mr. Birney stated in New-York, last May, in our hearing, and in the hearing of hundreds of others. These statements were published at the time, and there is no reason to doubt that they were repeatedly put in the hands of the editor of the Spectator, in the shape of exchange papers, if not otherwise. What then must be thought of his putting such a question as he does to us, at this time, relative to Mr. Birney's disposal of his slaves? We leave readers to judge for themselves.

(5.) *Id est*, if he understood "the things that belong to his peace," he would obey men rather than God! If he would not be mobbed and stoned in the streets again, the next time he visits New-York, he would cease to point out duty to the American Church, and to warn his countrymen of their sin and their danger!

(6.) We trust this letter may be among the last things to be forgotten by Samuel H. Cox, by Vermonters, by slave-holders, or by the American Church.

(7.) If he does not teach these doctrines, *Ex Cathedra*—from the Chair—and from the pulpit, he is unfaithful to his charge—unfaithful to the church—unfaithful to posterity—unfaithful to his own soul—unfaithful to his God. The day is at hand when they who teach the contrary doctrine will receive the execration of Christendom—ay, another day hastens on, when they will feel the frowns of Him who judges righteously.

(8.) On this point, we differ with the editor of the Spectator, by the width of the heavens. We maintain that "Christ and his apostles did so teach" and "so preach," as does the letter alluded to, in the above extract. It is not pretended that the letter of this article is the letter of the New Testament; but that the spirit of it is the spirit of New Testament teaching and preaching. Does the editor of the Spectator claim to be an opponent of slavery? If he does, why does he oppose it? Because it is holy? or because it is sinful? If because it is sinful, where does he learn that it is sinful but from Christ and his apostles? Will he first say that slavery is sinful, and then go to these divine teachers—to our holy Bible, to get support for a system of acknowledged sinfulness? If not, what will he do? Perhaps he will say that all men are sinners, so that if church fellowship be withdrawn from all sinners, it would be withdrawn from all men, and consequently there could be no church in an associated capacity. This reasoning will apply with equal force to the sin of profanity, or of drunkenness, as to the sin of slavery. Show us authority for withdrawing church fellowship from the profane swearer, the drunkard, or the fornicator, and we will show authority for withdrawing church fellowship from the extortioner, as is every slave-holder. We affirm, without fear of contradiction, that the spirit of all the teaching and preaching of our Savior and his apostles, that can be applied to church discipline, will cut off every wrong-doer who willfully persists in his wrong-doing, giving no evidence of repentance. Now we have taken it for granted that the editor of the Spectator would wish to be considered one of the number who hold that slavery is wrong-doing—is sin. And where is the evidence of repentance on the part of the slave-holders? They practically assert that slavery is not sin. Indeed we are called upon to extend and continue to them the hand of fel-

lowship, for the very reason that they hold that slavery is lawful and just—tolerated & sanctioned by the Bible. We are told that they have been educated slave-holders;—therefore we must be charitable. With equal propriety we might be told that the Jews who reject Jesus Christ, and look for another Messiah, have been educated so to do,—therefore, we ought to be charitable towards them; they profess to love and obey God. This same reasoning will apply to the Roman Catholics. All these have been educated to think that they are doing God service: Why then should we be uncharitable and dis fellowship them? It will not be pretended that American slave-holders are more excusable than these, because they have less opportunity to learn their duty from the Bible.

Is slave-holding a small sin, that it should be covered up in the church? Look, for a moment, at a single feature of it, in the light of a single case: At a late meeting of the Savannah River Baptist Association, composed of churches in South Carolina & Georgia, the following subject was under discussion:—"Whether in case of involuntary separation of such a character as to preclude all prospect of future intercourse, the parties ought to be allowed to marry again." Now mark the decision: "Such separation among persons situated as our slaves are, is civilly a separation by death, and in the sight of God it would be so viewed. To forbid second marriage in such a case, would be to expose the parties not only to strange hardships and strong temptations, but to church censure, for acting in obedience to their masters, who cannot be expected to acquiesce in a regulation at variance with justice to the slaves, and to the spirit of that command which regulates marriage among Christians. The slaves are not free agents; and a dissolution by death is not more entirely without their consent and beyond their control, than by such separation." Let this ecclesiastical decision be carefully read over, and over again, until its ungodliness and loathsomeness are manifest. The truth is this: Marriage among slaves, whether in the church or out, is sheer mockery. Slaveholders, professors of religion or non-professors, set at naught all conjugal relations among their slaves, at pleasure, when their lust or cupidity demands. This religious Association nullifies God's regulation of the marriage institution—blots out his seventh commandment to a portion of their own religious body, and thus throws open the flood-gates of adultery and uncleanness. This is but a single view of a hundred that might be taken, showing the revolting wickedness of the system, as practiced in church and out. This single paragraph of the doings of that religious body of soul-destroyers, presents several other points of horrifying view, which it is not needful here to dwell upon. We will barely mention one or two. In their own words: "The slaves are not free agents;" so that, whatever may be God's regulation of conjugal relations and duties, they are taught and compelled to disregard them all, and yield implicit obedience to these earthly monsters of sin. What says God? "Wherefore they [husband and wife] are no more joined, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But this infamous system comes in and puts them asunder; and the Savannah River Baptist Association gives them liberty to obey men rather than God—to cohabit and live in concubinage according to the will of those who have usurped the mastery over them. Again, according to the showing of this Association, this concubinage and pollution is forced upon the slaves, *volentes volentes*; for say they, "a dissolution by death is not more entirely without their consent and beyond their control, than by such separation." And yet this document contains no remonstrance—not a whisper of censure—no intimation that there is anything wrong or improper in this corrupting, loathsome business. Thus, while permission is given to the slave to set at naught one of Heaven's institutions, countenance is given to those who drive him to the foul deed. Indeed there is no want of evidence that professed Christians are extensively engaged in the ungodly traffic that disregards, not only the conjugal, but all social relations.

Does the grog-drinker contribute to perpetuate intemperance? Yes—all his professions to the contrary notwithstanding, while he associates with drunkards, and uses the drunkard's drink, his influence goes to perpetuate the sin of intemperance. So with every slave-holder. Whatever pretensions he may make to christianity, while he remains a slave-holder he is perpetuating a system that violates all the holy commands—that stops the fountains of knowledge—that shuts up and takes away the Bible—that pollutes and brutifies the body, heathenizes the mind, and murders the soul. From those who will have their hands in so grossly wicked a work, Samuel H. Cox exhorts to withdraw fellowship. William L. Stone says no—"Christ and his apostles did not so teach." Read 1 Corinthians, v. 11: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a FORNICATOR, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an EXTORTIONER; with such an one no not to eat." Where, in all of Christ's teaching, is the passage that requires us to dis fellowship any professor of Christianity?—there is the passage that enjoins dis fellowship of all who partake in the foul sin of slavery.